

United States District Court

**EASTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS
SHERMAN DIVISION**

PERFORMANCE PULSATION
CONTROL, INC.,

V.

SIGMA DRILLING TECHNOLOGIES,
LLC, INTREPID CONSULTING, LLC,
JUSTIN MANLEY, ALLISON MANLEY,
WILLIAM GARFIELD, ADVANCE
RUPTURE DISK TECHNOLOGY, INC.,

Civil Action No. 4:17-CV-00450
Judge Mazzant

MEMORANDUM OPINION AND ORDER

Pending before the Court is Plaintiff's Motion for Summary Judgment (Dkt. #230). After reviewing the relevant pleadings and motion, the Court finds motion should be denied.

On November 12, 2018, Plaintiff, Performance Pulsation Control, Inc., filed its motion for summary judgment (Dkt. #230). Defendants in this case filed its response to the motion on December 3, 2018 (Dkt. #252). Then on December 10, 2018, Plaintiff filed its reply (Dkt. #270) and Defendants filed their sur-reply on December 17, 2018 (Dkt. #285).

LEGAL STANDARD

The purpose of summary judgment is to isolate and dispose of factually unsupported claims or defenses. *Celotex Corp. v. Catrett*, 477 U.S. 317, 323–24 (1986). Summary judgment is proper under Rule 56(a) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure “if the movant shows that there is no genuine dispute as to any material fact and the movant is entitled to judgment as a matter of law.” FED. R. CIV. P. 56(a). A dispute about a material fact is genuine when “the evidence is such that a reasonable jury could return a verdict for the nonmoving party.” *Anderson v. Liberty Lobby Inc.*, 477 U.S. 242, 248 (1986). Substantive law identifies which facts are material. *Id.* The trial court

“must resolve all reasonable doubts in favor of the party opposing the motion for summary judgment.” *Casey Enters., Inc. v. Am. Hardware Mut. Ins. Co.*, 655 F.2d 598, 602 (5th Cir. 1981).

The party seeking summary judgment bears the initial burden of informing the court of its motion and identifying “depositions, documents, electronically stored information, affidavits or declarations, stipulations (including those made for purposes of the motion only), admissions, interrogatory answers, or other materials” that demonstrate the absence of a genuine issue of material fact. FED. R. CIV. P. 56(c)(1)(A); *Celotex*, 477 U.S. at 323. If the movant bears the burden of proof on a claim or defense for which it is moving for summary judgment, it must come forward with evidence that establishes “beyond peradventure *all* of the essential elements of the claim or defense.” *Fontenot v. Upjohn Co.*, 780 F.2d 1190, 1194 (5th Cir. 1986). Where the nonmovant bears the burden of proof, the movant may discharge the burden by showing that there is an absence of evidence to support the nonmovant’s case. *Celotex*, 477 U.S. at 325; *Byers v. Dall. Morning News, Inc.*, 209 F.3d 419, 424 (5th Cir. 2000). Once the movant has carried its burden, the nonmovant must “respond to the motion for summary judgment by setting forth particular facts indicating there is a genuine issue for trial.” *Byers*, 209 F.3d at 424 (citing *Anderson*, 477 U.S. at 248–49). A nonmovant must present affirmative evidence to defeat a properly supported motion for summary judgment. *Anderson*, 477 U.S. at 257. Mere denials of material facts, unsworn allegations, or arguments and assertions in briefs or legal memoranda will not suffice to carry this burden. Rather, the Court requires “significant probative evidence” from the nonmovant to dismiss a request for summary judgment. *In re Mun. Bond Reporting Antitrust Litig.*, 672 F.2d 436, 440 (5th Cir. 1982) (quoting *Ferguson v. Nat’l Broad. Co.*, 584 F.2d 111, 114 (5th Cir. 1978)). The Court must consider all of the evidence but “refrain from making any credibility determinations or

weighing the evidence.” *Turner v. Baylor Richardson Med. Ctr.*, 476 F.3d 337, 343 (5th Cir. 2007).

ANALYSIS

After a careful review of the record and the arguments presented, the Court is not convinced that Plaintiff has met its burden demonstrating that there is no material issue of fact as to Plaintiff’s claims entitling it to judgment as a matter of law. Any reasoning the Court used in orders on the various other motions for summary judgment in this case that are relevant to this motion, to the extent they are relevant, are hereby incorporated by reference. Accordingly, the Court finds that the motion should be denied.

CONCLUSION

It is therefore **ORDERED** that Plaintiff’s Motion for Summary Judgment (Dkt. #230) is hereby **DENIED**.

SIGNED this 11th day of March, 2019.


AMOS L. MAZZANT
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE